

well spread out. It is a very moving memorial. Again, I urge everybody to go down and take a look at it when they can.

I thank Senator REID for his kind comments.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, while my friend from Rhode Island is on the floor, I, too, was stuck here and could not get to the dedication of the memorial this afternoon. I felt terrible not being able to be there because I really had planned to be there and wanted to be there. One of the reasons I wanted to be there was because of our colleagues who fought, for whom I have such enduring respect. And as that memorial reminds each of us of the sacrifices of those who fought in Korea, we also have to count our blessings for those who survived Korea. And one of those blessings is JOHN CHAFEE.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Well, Mr. President, I did not start this. I did not start this this afternoon, for this particular reason. But I do want to thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his very, very kind comments. And I appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 15 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### FEDERAL FUNDING FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, Senator BOB BENNETT and I introduced a bill yesterday that redefines the Federal role in providing assistance to the arts.

We believe there is an excellent case to be made for continued Federal arts and humanities funding. But past experience has shown clearly that the role of the Federal Government in artistic endeavor must be focused on more citizen involvement—and more common sense.

At the heart of this bill we have introduced is a belief that culture counts. Mr. President, the students on Tiananmen Square in 1989 who created a statue of freedom in the likeness of our Statue of Liberty had no difficulty identifying the unifying themes of American culture.

We Americans, on the other hand, are immersed in—and sometimes over-

exposed to—its more contentious aspects. As a result, sometimes we see it less clearly. We debate whether we have a common culture and if so, what it is and who it represents.

Federal support for the arts is a case in point. Most federally supported arts projects promote mainstream excellence and the widest possible public enjoyment.

But by allocating tax dollars to a few outrageous and patently offensive projects that claimed to have cornered the market on American culture, the National Endowment for the Arts has managed to alienate legions of Americans—voters and policymakers alike. Its excesses have led many to conclude that Federal support for the arts should be terminated. That, I believe, would be an unfortunate policy, one that would dim the light of American culture to an even greater degree.

Committed as I am to a balanced Federal budget, I think that Federal funding for the arts and humanities should be continued as a national policy to preserve an American heritage—if we can return to our original purpose in creating these programs, and if we can ensure that no more Federal funds end up in the hands of those who are willfully offensive.

Our bill redirects Federal support for the arts, humanities and museum activities away from the self-indulgently obscene and the safely mediocre and toward the creation and support of community-based programs. By this I mean locally and regionally based theater, dance, opera and museums.

To accomplish this we propose combining the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Institute of Museum Services into one agency. This new joint endowment would devolve as much of its decisionmaking authority as possible to the States—and to the people whose tax dollars support it.

The new endowment would continue to make direct grants to support nationally significant endeavors in the arts and humanities. However, the bulk of public resources would go directly to the States to promote greater access to the arts in our schools and communities, to continue worthy public projects in the humanities and to strengthen local museums.

The consolidation we propose would streamline the existing endowment apparatus. This new endowment would be headed up by three deputy directors—one each for the arts, for the humanities and for museum services. The current 52-member advisory board would be replaced by a national council comprised of 18 members selected for their knowledge and achievements. Six would be chosen by the Senate, six by the House, and six by the President.

One of the primary objectives of this bill is to reduce the size of the existing endowment bureaucracy in Washington, and to return resources and decisionmaking responsibilities of cities, regional groups and currently underserved areas.

Our bill provides that no more than 9 percent of appropriated funds go to administrative functions, and it defines two basic grant categories: 40 percent earmarked for grants of national significance and 60 percent allocated for grants to the States. A portion of the States' grants would be dedicated to strengthening primary and secondary education in the arts.

It is very important that we go into our schools, and have an appreciation shown for our young people in the arts and our American culture. Humanities and museum activities would be covered by our bill. We put special emphasis on communities which for geographic or economic reasons cannot otherwise sustain arts, and arts education programs.

Let me make this very clear: Our bill prohibits any money appropriated under this act from being used to fund projects which violate standards of common decency. Nor may any of these resources be used, directly or indirectly, for lobbying. Arts funding goes to institutions and organizations not individual artists.

In our bill, we focus on accountability, on ensuring that allocations are cost effective—and that they are made in a way that emphasizes merit and excellence.

The thrust of this bill is to conserve and showcase our State and national treasures, those great cultural institutions that are our legacy to our children—our world class museums, libraries, dance companies, orchestras, theater companies, and university presses. With the financial support of private donors, and of the States and the Federal Government, these intellectual and cultural power centers will have the potential to spin off a host of other creative activities that will enrich the lives of all of our people.

Our country will benefit—culturally, spiritually, and economically—from appropriately delineated Federal support for the arts. Americans rightly demand an end to obscenity and outrage, but not withdrawal of all government support for the cream of our culture.

There are those who argue that all cultures—and all levels of culture—are equal, and that there is no real American culture at all, but rather only an amalgam of diverse cultures.

But this deliberate balkanization of American culture ignores our singular heritage which has drawn from many sources to create a body of American arts and letters what is uniquely our own. *E pluribus unum*—out of many, one. It is a living tradition worth sustaining.

Mr. President, I believe that the bill we have presented today contains a formula for arts funding—and the encouragement of our native culture—that can regain the confidence and support of the American people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Abilene Reporter-News that talks about the importance of keeping

arts funding for our smaller communities like Abilene, TX. It is very important that we be able to have an opera in Abilene, as we have had in the last 2 weeks, an artwalk that has been a great boon to the cultural prospects of a great city like Abilene.

This happens all over America, Mr. President, and I do not want that cultural enlightenment that we have put into our smaller cities to die, and that is why Senator BENNETT and I are trying to make a significant contribution to keeping what is good about the arts funding and our American culture while not allowing the obscenities that have turned our taxpayers off of these other good projects.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Abilene Reporter-News, July 27, 1995]

#### HUTCHISON WEIGHS IN ON BEHALF OF THE ARTS

House Republicans have been jumping on the philistine bandwagon, but Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison thinks there's a better route to follow than the one that sends funding for the arts careening over the cliff.

She's right, and she has a sound plan for how to accomplish it.

The House has voted to cut the National Endowment for the Arts by 40 percent in fiscal 1996. House GOP leaders have agreed to fund the NEA only for the next two years and promise to try to terminate the agency after that.

Republicans in the Senate, however, have shown more awareness of the value of the arts, both economically and socially, to local communities throughout the country. A bill by Republican senators Nancy Kassebaum of Kansas and Jim Jeffords of Vermont that would cut the NEA by a more modest 25 percent over five years was passed last week by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee.

Hutchison's bill is an improvement over that one.

She would consolidate the NEA with the National Endowment for the Humanities and the federal Institute of Museum Services. During so would eliminate bureaucratic duplication of agencies so similar in scope that they often operate in conjunction anyway and would allow their funding under a new umbrella entity to remain at current levels for the next five years.

Furthermore, the key element of Hutchison's measure would direct 60 percent of all NEA and NEH funding to states in the form of block grants. This distribution would put the arts closer to the people of middle America who stand to benefit the most from it and drastically reduce the likelihood that nationally funded projects would turn out to be objectionable to most average taxpayers.

Hutchison's block grant idea would be especially good for Texas, which now ranks at the bottom in state spending for the arts. According to the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, Texas spends a paltry 18.5 cents per person a year on the arts, whereas the national average is 99.14 cents. Hutchison's bill would give the arts in Texas a huge boost by requiring a certain amount of federal money to be spent here.

As the Texas senator said in announcing her proposal, arts are the thread of civilization and the fabric of society. Everyone who turned out for this month's Artwalk downtown or attended the Abilene Opera Associa-

tion's magnificent production of "La Traviata" knows the arts bring something beyond mere entertainment to a community that cannot be achieved in any other way. If we don't support the arts, we're letting go of civilization's thread and tossing society's fabric in the trash.

Hutchison deserves a lot of credit and enthusiastic support for bucking the popular but misguided trend in her party to gut the arts and for instead committing herself to the programs and the values that her constituents will gain the most from.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

#### CONGRESSIONAL GIFT REFORM ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of S. 1061, and that Senator MCCAIN be recognized to offer his substitute amendment, and there be 1 hour for debate on the substitute to be equally divided in the usual form, and it be subject to the following first-degree amendments, with no second-degree amendments in order and no amendments to the language proposed to be stricken, with all first-degree amendments limited to 1 hour to be equally divided in the usual form if that much time is needed: A Byrd amendment, sense of the Senate on the judiciary; a Rockefeller amendment with regard to gift rules; a Brown amendment regarding blind trust and reporting; one amendment on spouses by Senator DOLE or his designee; one amendment on charitable trips by Senator DOLE or his designee; one amendment on definition of friendship for Senator DOLE or his designee; one amendment on the limit involved in the gift rule issue by Senator DOLE or his designee; one amendment on events by Senator DOLE or his designee; one amendment by Senator WELLSTONE regarding gift rules limits; and one amendment from Senator DOLE regarding gift rules.

I further ask that following the disposition of the above listed amendments, there be 1 hour equally divided for debate only, the Senate proceed to vote on the substitute, as amended, if amended, to be followed by third reading, if applicable, and passage of the gift rule measure, all without intervening action or debate except as provided for in the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. President, I would like to say this has been discussed by all the various parties that have been involved in this effort. It has been carefully reviewed by the leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle, and I believe that this is an agreement that we can go with and get this job done.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object. I tried to follow him very closely. At the third line from the bottom of

the unanimous-consent agreement, " \* \* \* disposition of the above listed amendments, the Senate proceed"—

Mr. LOTT. We added at that point, "there be 1 hour equally divided for debate only."

Mr. FORD. There be 1 hour for debate equally divided between the two leaders. That is it.

Mr. LOTT. That is right.

Mr. FORD. OK. I just wanted to be sure—we worked so hard on this—that the language was correct. We penciled in a couple things here.

We have no objection and look forward to the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I might say for the information of all Members now that we have this unanimous-consent agreement, we are ready to go ahead with the debate. I see Senator MCCAIN is ready. We hope to continue to work on some of these amendments and hopefully all of them will not be necessary. We will try to dispose of them as expeditiously as we can.

With regard to what time will be used tonight and whether or not there will be votes tonight, we do not have any order on that at this time. We just need to proceed, and as soon as an agreement is reached on that, we will certainly let the Members know immediately.

I yield the floor.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1872

(Purpose: To provide for Senate gift reform)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute at the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. KYL, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. GRAMS, proposes an amendment numbered 1872.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate on the amendment will be limited to 1 hour equally divided.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. President, the agreement that we have crafted after many, many hours of discussion and debate is one that is very emotional. I do not know of an issue that arouses more emotion in the Members than one that has to do with modification of the lifestyle of the Members of the Senate.

I believe there is a recognition on the part of all in this body that we are expected to live as all of the citizens in